

atty sent
Hed Red 12/15/00
#9

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/334,256

Applicant(s)
RICHARDSON et al.

Examiner
Forest Thompson Jr.

Group Art Unit
2165

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Forest Thompson Jr.

(3) Jon Grossman

(2) Vincent Millen

(4) Douglas Clark

Date of Interview 10/24/00

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Applicant demonstrated the invention on a computer, illustrating the features and characteristics of his invention.

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

William R. Duncan, "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge," Project management Institute, 1996.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We reviewed with applicant the claims as presently amended. Applicant demonstrated and described his invention. Applicant stated that claim language will be amended to incorporate modeling, multiple tasks for multiple users, and activating one of a plurality of tasking horizons. Examiner stated that current amended claims with the proposed changes appear to be distinguishable over Duncan as an anticipatory reference. Examiner stated that an additional prior art search must be accomplished for any amendment submitted. Applicant agrees to provide an amendment to the current claims with the above language in the near future. Applicant was told of the necessity for a quick action on their part to submit an amendment to the recently filed amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Forest Thompson
Art 2165
Au 2165

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action. (703) 306-5449